

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Asakura et al. (US 6,531,329).

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (US 6,678,029).

Claims 7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Asakura et al.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 11 is objected to for a minor informality.

The Title of the Invention is objected to for not being descriptive.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indication that claims 2 and 3 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended the Title of the invention, amended claims 1, 7, and 8 to further define the invention, and amended claims 11 to correct a minor informality. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are pending for further consideration.

Objection to the Title of the Invention

The Title of the Invention is objected to for not being descriptive. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the Title in light of the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, Applicant

respectfully submits that the presently amended Title is clearly descriptive of the claimed invention, and respectfully requests that the objection to the Title be withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 11 is objected to for a minor informality. Specifically, the Office Action suggests that use of the phrase “the liquid crystal injection hole,” as recited by claim 11, has no appropriate antecedent. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 11 to be dependent upon claim 10, which recites “at least one liquid crystal injection hole.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11, as presently amended, provides appropriate antecedent basis for the features recited in claim 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 11 be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that recitation of “a volume of both ends of the seal line at each corner of the seal pattern increases to be connected together,” as recited by claim 8, is unclear. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 8 in accordance with the Examiner’s comments to recite “wherein an area of the seal line at each corner of the seal pattern increases during the adhering of the first and second substrates.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, and respectfully submits that claim 8 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Asakura et al. (US 6,531,329), claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (US 6,678,029), and claims 7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Asakura et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a plurality of venting portions formed in the seal pattern at corner portions of the first and second substrates for venting air confined between the first and second substrates,” wherein “each corner portion of the first and second substrates includes at least one of the vent portions extending from the seal pattern.” Similarly, independent claim 7, as amended, recites a method of manufacturing a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “forming a seal pattern along an outer peripheral surface of the first substrate, the seal pattern configured such that a seal line is discontinuous at each corner of the first and second substrates to form a vent portion extending from the seal pattern.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, both Asakura et al. and Suzuki, whether taken singly or combined, neither teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 1 and 7, and hence dependent claims 2-6 and 8-11. For example, although Asakura et al. may disclose a plurality of notch portions H₁ to H₈ and Suzuki may disclose a plurality of outlets 15A-D, Applicant respectfully asserts that Asakura et al. and Suzuki are completely silent with regard to each corner portion of the first and second substrates

including “at least one of the vent portions extending from the seal pattern,” as recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-6, and are completely silent with regard to forming a discontinuous seal line “at each corner of the first and second substrates to form a vent portion extending from the seal pattern,” as recited by amended independent claim 7, and hence dependent claims 8-11.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combined teaching of Asakura et al. and Suzuki fails to make obvious the combination of features recited by claims 1-11. For example, Applicant respectfully asserts that since neither Asakura et al. nor Suzuki teach or suggest every feature of claims 1-11, combining the teachings of Asakura et al. and Suzuki would fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 1-11.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103 should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: December 16, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000